R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 863 AC 001 318

EDUCATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND LEADERSHIP FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES, A REPORT OF THE FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION AND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE PROJECT.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE (DOA), WASHINGTON, D.C.
REPORT NUMBER ER-AND-T-138-11-66 PUB DATE NOV 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80 45P.

DESCRIPTORS- *RURAL EXTENSION, *PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, *LEADERSHIP TRAINING, PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION, CONSULTANTS, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, EXTENSION AGENTS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, CITIZENSHIP, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE,

A PILOT PROJECT (JULY 1959-DECEMBER 1961), AIMED AT NEW WAYS TO ADVANCE EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND LEADERSHIP IN THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, WAS CONDUCTED IN 12 COUNTIES OF SIX STATES. PROGRAM CONSULTANTS RECEIVED TEN WEEKS TRAINING BUILT AROUND A SEMINAR ON CURRENT ISSUES AND ACTIVITIES, AND FOLLOWED BY ORIENTATION CONFERENCES. CONSULTANTS ASSISTED COUNTY EXTENSION STAFF MEMBERS IN PLANNING, ORGANIZING, CONDUCTING, AND REPORTING PROJECT ACTIVITIES. THE EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT, CONDUCTED PRINCIPALLY DURING 1963-64, INDICATED DEFINITE PROGRAM CHANGES IN ELEVEN OF THE COUNTIES (MAINLY IN ORGANIZATION, ACTION, EVALUATION, SUBJECT CONTENT, AND BROADENED CLIENTELE BASE), AND LOCAL ACHIEVEMENTS IN SUCH AREAS AS GOVERNMENTAL AND SCHOOL CHANGE, CIVIC PARTICIPATION, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS. FORUMS AND SHORT COURSES WERE THE MOST EFFECTIVE TECHNIQUES IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION, BUT WERE USED LITTLE. THE CONSULTANTS' OWN TRAINING SEEMED GENERALLY ADEQUATE. OBSTACLES TO THE SUCCESS OF THE PROJECT WERE FELT TO BE THE SHORTNESS OF THE TWO AND ONE-HALF YEAR PERIOD, A LACK OF COMMUNICATION AND UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN CONSULTANTS AND COUNTY AGENTS, AND LACK OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR THE PROGRAM. (DOCUMENT INCLUDES A BUDGET ESTIMATE AND 6 TABLES). (LY)

Federal Extension Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012863

A Report of the

Fund for Adult Education

and

Cooperative Extension Service Project

for

EDUCATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

and

LEADERSHIP FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES

AC001318E

ER&T-133 (11-66)

FOREWORD

This project was a joint undertaking by the Fund for Adult Education of the Ford Foundation and the Cooperative Extension Service. It was conceived as a pilot project and designed to demonstrate how to advance education in public affairs and leadership for public responsibilities in the Cooperative Extension Service.

Two counties in each of six States were selected for the 2½-year pilot project. In each county a program consultant who had received specialist training in public affairs operated behind the scenes as advisor to county Extension staff members for the duration of the project. Consultants assisted the county Extension staff members in planning, organizing, conducting and reporting project activities. A national project coordinator worked full time during the course of the project counseling with the program consultants and arranging for their specialized training.

This is a report of the evaluation of the project which has involved all participants in each of the six States and twelve counties. It was conducted principally in 1963-64. Replies of each participant, relevant reports and important papers were used in the evaluation of this project. The author has attempted to employ as much objectivity in this evaluation as possible. However, deviation from this policy was necessary to fully explore the impact of this project.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This evaluation was initiated by Dr. Joseph L. Matthews of the Division of Extension Research and Training in the interest of project completion and as a means of transmitting information of value learned during the course of the project. He provided the guidance and leadership for the field work and report preparation.

Major credit is due the State Extension Directors in the six project States for making this evaluation possible. The Program Consultants, who carried the major program burden along with county Extension staff members, were very cooperative and helpful. Their cooperation is gratefully acknowledged. Also appreciated are the contributions of the many other State and area Extension staff personnel who were involved in the project evaluation and who gave so freely of their time that this report could be prepared.

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	Action Taken in Each County With Respect to the Formation of a Program Development Committee for the FAE-CES Project	20
Table 2.	Percentage of Personnel Time Devoted to the FAE Project in the Project Counties	22
Table 3.	Program Consultants' Reports as to Whether There Was or Was Not a Positive Change in County Extension Staff Members' Attitudes Toward Public Affairs Education and the Extent of the Changes	28
Table 4.	Program Consultants' Opinions of the Obstacles and Impediments to Progress in the FAE Project, 1963	31
Table 5.	Program Consultants' Opinions on the Desirable Duration of This Type Project	32
Table 6.	Program Consultants' Ratings of Their Role as Program Consultant	33

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
A Brief Summary of a Proposal for Defining and Developing an Enriched Educational Program for Adults Reached by the Cooperative Extension Service	3
Criteria for State participation	10
Criteria for selecting counties in the participating States	10
Criteria for selection of a county program consultant	11
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT IN COUNTIES AND STATES	14
County objectives	16
County project committee	19
Personnel time devoted to the project	21
Subjects commonly presented in the program	23
Methods used in carrying out public affairs education	24
ACCOMPLISHMENTS	25
Changes in citizens' attitudes	25
New leadership roles	26
Community development	27
Economic development	27
Governmental changes	27
School system	28
Staff members' attitudes toward public affairs education	28
Things learned and applied	29
OBSTACLES TO PROJECT PROGRESS	31
Duration of the project	32
Consultants' ratings of their role	32
Program consultants' attitudes toward repeating the FAE-CES project experience	33
Progress and the consultants' role	33
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	35
General observations	37

INTRODUCTION

An experimental pilot county approach to public affairs education was jointly undertaken by the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education (FAE) and the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) during the period July 1959 - December 1961. The project carried out in two counties in each of six States was an experimental effort to establish new concepts and methods in Extension adult education in rural America. The FAE looked upon this as an opportunity to expand its little, previous experience in the field of rural adult education. The FAE later reported, "In 1958 an opportunity opened for the Fund to work with Extension on a larger scale." Established in 1951 by the Ford Foundation the Fund had only minor experience in dealing with rural adult education.1/ Here was an occasion to not only experiment in means to progress in rural adult education but with a nationwide government-university integrated educational organization which is the largest adult-educational organization in the world. In the meantime, about April 1958, the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy issued "A Statement of Scope and Responsibilities" which outlined nine areas of Extension program responsibility. Two of the nine program areas emphasized by the Cooperative Extension Service were "public affairs" and "leadership development." More than half of the State Extension services soon issued similar statements recommending a broader conception of their role.

The Cooperative Extension Service was actively engaged in the search for a more refined definition of its role, new techniques in Extension methodology and new program direction. The Scope Report lent direction and objectivity and pointed to the need for such a project.2/ Contributing influences were the desire to provide additional segments of the population with an adult educational program; a diminishing farm population; the desire of some Extension leaders for a program educationally oriented as opposed to the service function; and the desire to probe further into the economic, social and political structure of the community in order to assist with orderly change. All of these caused Extension personnel to be especially alerted to opportunities to develop new methods, materials and approaches.

The authors of the project also entertained hopes for considerable experimentation with the vehicle of program development. Program development implies the involvement of large numbers of local citizenry in program design and implementation. Therefore, it was believed that such a project would be

---

1/ It made grants for State projects in Iowa and North Dakota and for a district project by West Georgia College. It had made a grant to the Graduate School of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for meetings of the directors and instructors of the five regional summer schools for agricultural agents. Two workshops had been held--at Purdue University in the fall of 1954 and at Louisiana State University in the fall of 1955.

2/ "The Cooperative Extension Service Today, A Statement of Scope and Responsibility," The Cooperative Extension Service, April 1958.

an ideal opportunity to experiment in this phase of Extension methodology. This effort then would result in the formation of a group of key, public-minded citizens in each county who with the aid of Extension personnel would give direction and support to the program in the local context.

In view then of the goals and objectives of the Fund for Adult Education and that of the Cooperative Extension Service, it appeared that there was mutual advantage to be achieved through a cooperative effort of this nature by the two organizations.

The possibility and desirability of the Cooperative Extension Service cooperating with the Fund for Adult Education on a joint educational project was formally called to the attention of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy in the Committee's November 1957 meeting in Denver, Colorado. Prior to this meeting informal discussions had been conducted by Robert Blakeley, representative of the Fund for Adult Education, with the Administrator of the Federal Extension Service. Early in the Denver meeting the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy tabled action on the proposal to cooperate with the Fund until after the Scope Committee3/ report had been submitted which was on the agenda for later in the meeting. Following the report of the Scope Committee, the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) agreed to appoint a committee to further explore the potential with respect to the Fund.

The next regular meeting of ECOP occurred in June 1958 in Washington, D.C., and a report of the subcommittee was made by Director John Hutchison of Texas. The subcommittee in consultation with Robert Blakeley had developed a proposal plan which was presented to ECOP and which follows (pages 3-7):

3/ Committee responsible for developing the Scope Report on the Statement of Scope and Responsibility of the Extension Service.

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF A PROPOSAL FOR DEFINING AND DEVELOPING AN ENRICHED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ADULTS REACHED BY THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

What this is about

This is a proposal for helping the Cooperative Extension Service to set its feet firmly on a course that will achieve some of the high aims that have always been professed but not always translated into action on a broad front. The objectives are to develop special or improved programs that will contribute to the ability of the citizenry involved:

1. To think clearly and critically about social and economic problems.
2. To respect objective evidence as the basis for decisions.
3. To act on sound decisions arrived at by democratic procedures.
4. To gain knowledge of themselves, their gifts, limitations and values.
5. To learn about the basis of the behavior of others and about other cultures than their own.
6. To learn about man's social, artistic and intellectual achievements.

What can be accomplished

This proposal provides for action designed to have impact on the people and the State Cooperative Extension Services involved. The specific results that can be achieved are:

1. To provide for the people enriched educational experiences not now available to them through the Cooperative Extension Service and in some areas not available in any other education agency or organization.
2. To provide a nucleus of the staff in the participating States with special education and training for organizing programs of adult education that incorporate the educational objectives listed in the first part of this proposal.
3. To demonstrate through successful experimental programs within the participating States some practical programming procedures that incorporate the educational objectives stated above.
4. To produce special content and method materials to support the experimental programs and that can be used to spread the experimental program results to other counties and other States.

5 To stimulate the people and the Cooperative Extension Service nationally to develop enriched programs and build upon the experiences gained from this project.

A course is charted

The Cooperative Extension Service is engrossed in efforts to improve its programs. New approaches and new emphases have emerged during the last five years resulting from deliberations and decisions of the policy and administrative leadership in the States. Widespread concern with the program development process recognizes that the way in which the program is determined is in itself an educational process fully as important as the other educational activities that result from it. It recognizes too that this process can result in subtle and indirect education that teaches leadership, citizenship skills and appreciation of the importance of democratic social action. The extent and the quality of involvement of the people who have needs that they may or may not recognize determines whether or not they can be helped to see themselves and their world in new ways and with new understandings.

What to include in the program has received attention too. A report entitled "The Cooperative Extension Service Today" prepared by a subcommittee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy points out several areas of major program emphasis for the years ahead. The report singles out some program content areas that in the past have not received major emphasis generally.

All of American society is changing with some of the most rapid and dramatic changes occurring in rural and suburban areas. The Cooperative Extension Service must change its programs to better meet the needs of the clientele it serves and the Extension worker must acquire new understandings and skills.

Some changes are needed in the content of Cooperative Extension programs and changes in educational methods are needed. Program planning as an educational process needs to be further developed to incorporate more effective experiences to help develop new citizenship and leadership skills.

What then is needed

An external influence is needed to help focus on objectives and bring about concerted action toward goals that are clear to many but not to others. Action can be greatly accelerated through special training of a key leadership group in each State, through proving the value of basic knowledge when properly applied in programming and through preparing special written materials to support the improved programs.

What action is proposed

The proposed action is designed to initiate and sustain effort for several years that will have far reaching and lasting results in the Cooperative

Extension Service and more importantly on the people it serves. Four separate lines of action are sketched below that are mutually supporting in a way that will achieve results on a broad front and at the same time involve a basic approach that should have lasting effects.

I. Definition of a Pattern for Program Experimentation and Staff Training

Initially much study and planning may be needed to determine the general design of the experimental programs to decide upon the procedures to follow in initiating the program in the participating States and to determine the precise nature of the needed staff training. The machinery for accomplishing these purposes could be a planning committee.

II. Seminars in Liberal Education and Program Development for State Program Leaders

This experience would be designed to increase their appreciation and understanding of the value and possibilities of incorporating new content and new educational forms into programs. A staff of nationally recognized leaders with practical experience in the selected fields would be assembled to lead and instruct the group. A seminar of several weeks' duration is to be held in the fall of 1959 for persons who have Statewide coordinating and program responsibility for a major phase of the total Extension program, such as State program leaders for home economics, agriculture and 4-H club work.

III. Experimental Programs

Pilot Extension programs designed to demonstrate successful educational programs incorporating new content and new educational methods would be established. The objectives of the experimental programs would be to:

1. Test out and evaluate theoretical models for developing county programs that emphasize preparation for higher levels of living as contrasted with merely earning a living.

2. In the setting of an in-service training experience for county Extension staff members to experiment with improved methods of utilizing lay leaders in developing new kinds of programs.

3. Through the use of trained participant-observers to record and evaluate the experiences so that they can be transplanted to other States and counties.

Design

Pilot programs would be established in a number of States concurrently to serve as demonstrations within the States and for other States as well. Each pilot county would have a qualified participant-observer to assist the regular

staff in programming and to observe and record the program development processes and results of the action program for later analysis and evaluation. The program to give particular emphasis to obtaining wide participation and decision making by the people, and to training volunteer leaders to assume major responsibility in both the planning process and the resulting action program.

IV. Institute for the Participant-Observers

The county and State staff members that are to be involved with the pilot counties would need to be prepared to carry out their responsibilities. The purpose would be-

to provide basic education and training for the participant-observers to function effectively in the pilot counties.

The Plan

Arrangements would be made with a college or university that has the appropriate facilities and staff competencies and that was willing to provide the needed educational experiences to be determined in advance under the direction of a planning committee.

V. Preparation of New Materials on Program Development

This would include preparation and publication of written materials on appropriate program methods and teaching materials.

Objective:

1. To prepare staff training materials based upon and adapted from education and other applicable research materials.

2. To prepare special subject matter or background materials not now available on such topics as public affairs, citizenship, leadership development and social trends.

The Plan

Employ a qualified person to take leadership in this effort working under the guidance of the project coordinator. Possibly grants could be made to qualified graduate students or otherwise to contract for the production of special materials that may be needed.

VI. Administrative and Operational Plan

Committees:

1. A project advisory committee to give overall direction of the project would be appointed by the Federal Extension Service with the advice and counsel of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy.

2. Technical or planning committees would be appointed by the Federal Extension Service. Membership to include one or more members of the project advisory committee but drawn mainly from the education and the social science disciplines that can contribute to helping accomplish the objectives of this project. The committees would have responsibility for reviewing the technical aspects of the project and would assist with general planning.

Staff:

1. A project coordinator attached to the Federal Extension Service, ex-officio member of the project advisory committee and of the technical and planning committees. This person would be responsible for helping initiate, develop and coordinate action to accomplish the purposes of this project.

2. Secretary and staff assistants as needed.

BUDGET ESTIMATE

	1959	1960	1961	Total
1. Expenses for consultant services to Advisory and/or Planning Committees	3,000			3,000
2. Seminar (States pay subsistence)	20,000			20,000
3. Participant-observer training (12 persons @ $4,000)	48,000			48,000
4. Experimental programs (12 counties @ $5,000 each per year, States share one-half of cost)		60,000	60,000	120,000
5. Evaluation of results or experimental programs ($1,000 per participating county per year)	12,000	12,000	12,000	36,000
6. Preparation of materials	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000
7. Project coordinator (Salary and travel expenses)	14,000	14,000	14,000	42,000
TOTALS	112,000	101,000	101,000	314,000

After the presentation to ECOP, the plan was approved and the committee was commended for an excellent job in such a short period of time.

With the approval by ECOP the Fund proceeded to implement the plan for an experimental effort in public affairs. A logical step included the announcement of the project by reporting that the Fund was making available grants to from four to six States to encourage and assist the Extension Service in giving greater emphasis to two areas outlined in the "Scope Report," "the education of adults in public affairs and for their public responsibilities."

The announcement further specified that a grant of $40,000 per State would be made to cooperating States for the period July 1, 1959, to December 31, 1961. Further, that at least one of these grants and not more than two would be made to States in each of the four Extension regions. The conditions of the grants were clearly stated as follows (items 1-3):

1. That the programs be pilot projects to demonstrate how to advance education in public affairs and leadership for public responsibilities in a State Cooperative Extension Service; that there be pilot projects in two counties in each of the participating States.

2. That there be a program consultant assigned in each of the two counties in each of the participating States; that these program consultants work full time with the county agricultural, home economics and 4-H Club agents to help the county staff to develop or improve and to extend education in public affairs and for public responsibilities as an integral and major phase of the program; and that evaluation of the educational activities and their results be one function of the program consultant.

3. That each land-grant college or university applying for a grant agree to bear the expenses equal to one-half the salaries of the two program consultants; designate the two persons who would be the program consultants; express the expectation that these persons would be on the staff of the State Agricultural Extension Service at the conclusion of the project; designate the two counties in which the pilot project would take place; and agree to take part in cooperative activities which will relate the State projects.

   These cooperative activities were to be:

   a. A meeting at Fund expense where the State Directors of Cooperative Extension and the program consultants from the participating States will plan their activities within the framework of the project.

   b. A special ten-week training session during the summer of 1959 at Fund expense for the eight to twelve program consultants.

c. A two-week institute in the fall of 1959 at Fund expense for the following from each of the participating States: the two agricultural program consultants; the State program leader for county agents; the State program leader for home economics agents; and the State program leader for 4-H Club agents.

d. Two one-week seminars for the eight to twelve program consultants during 1960 and two one-week seminars for them in 1961. The travel and living costs to the program consultants for these seminars were to be borne by the participating States, either out of the grant from the Fund or from other resources.

e. The pilot projects in the four to six States were to be related by a project coordinator, made available from one of the land-grant universities with financial assistance by the Fund. He was to plan with State persons involved in the project; and, with advice, direct the training session in the summer of 1959; direct the institutes in the fall of 1959 and run the seminars in 1960 and 1961. He was to also visit the States as necessary to accomplish the purposes of the project; call attention to good substantive materials in the fields of public affairs and public responsibilities; assist States with their evaluation activities and maintenance of records needed for a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the experiences in all States. This analysis and evaluation was to be presented by the coordinator in a detailed report after the completion of the project.

In this project the minimum contribution of each participating State--in paying half the salaries of the two program consultants, and in providing facilities, services and supporting resources--was to approximately equal the $40,000 grant from the Fund.

The Fund was to select and announce the grants to the participating States as soon as possible, in any event before May 31, 1959. The initial planning meeting was to be held during June 1959 and the training sessions for program consultants were to be held in the summer of 1959. The institute was to follow the consultant training session in the early fall of 1959.

Applying State Cooperative Extension Services were to observe the conditions described above. In addition they were to: (1) explain the institution's conception of education of adults in public affairs and public responsibilities; (2) give the reasons why the two counties are designated pilot counties; (3) give the qualifications of the two persons nominated for program consultants; (4) describe the social science departments of the college or university and any special working relationships between them and the Cooperative Extension Service to implement this project; (5) indicate that the proposal is being made officially; and (6) provide evidence of the status of the institution concerning exemption from federal taxation.

It is interesting to review at this point, to cast light upon the project planning and as a future reference in evaluating State and county activities, criteria developed by the Fund and sent to the States for use in helping to decide whether they should apply for a participating grant.

These criteria were dated March 31, 1959, and are of value to the reader in evaluating the degree of use of these criteria made by participating States (these follow as items I through III).

I. Criteria for State participation:

1. A definite interest in the State in improving personnel and programs in the direction of the objectives of this project.

2. Willingness to experiment with new approaches, new methods and techniques, and new program subject matter that are broader than traditional Extension programs, and incur the risk of some failures.

3. Willingness to establish the administrative and supervisory climate that will allow innovations in programs and procedures and tolerate failure if it occurs.

4. Willingness to follow through in thoroughly preparing the county and State staff for their part in the project.

5. Ability to provide two or more counties that meet the criteria for participation.

6. Willingness to assure the county staff members and the program consultant a measure of security for the future in return for participation in the experiment.

7. Willingness of State staff to work as a team on an experimental program.

8. Willingness to underwrite the State share of expenses as provided for in the announcement.

9. Willingness to have the program consultants participate in the coordinating activities arranged for them by the coordinator.

II. Criteria for selecting counties in the participating States:

1. A county Extension staff willing to work as a team on an experimental program.

2. A staff willing to undertake experiments with new programs and new methods that may deviate from tradition in Extension generally, and in the county particularly, at the same time recognizing the inherent risks of failure.

3. A staff willing to accept the new member in the role of a resource person and technician for program operations including evaluation, but as participant-observer in the action phases.

4. A staff willing to cooperate with the program consultant and others on a coordinated evaluation plan and such special evaluevaluations as may be agreed upon or planned as a part of the project.

5. A staff willing to devote the needed time and effort for developing realistic plans and carrying out the plans.

III. Criteria for selection of a county program consultant:

An individual:

1. With successful experiences in extension work, although not necessarily presently employed by the Cooperative Extension Service.

2. Who has or can win the confidence of other experienced Extension workers on the State and county staffs and especially those in the experimental county.

3. Who has demonstrated leadership ability in democratic working situations both with individuals and groups.

4. Who has demonstrated above-average academic scholarship abilities in the social sciences.

5. Who can work well in a situation where he has a backstage role to assist in the planning but does not personally take charge or have major responsibility for action connected with the program.

6. Who is emotionally mature, psychologically secure, and both willing and able to undergo the hard work, inconveniences and insecurity of two and one-half years' experimentation with its attendant risks.

7. Who has demonstrated ability as a writer for publication and as a convincing speaker in both formal and informal situations.

Early in the implementation phase the Fund defined "public affairs" and "education for public responsibilities." The definition of public affairs as defined and as applied throughout the project meant: "Public concerns other than the vocational concerns of farming and family. Although 'public affairs' in agricultural Extension sometimes refers narrowly to the current federal policies concerning agriculture, here it means the whole range of public matters--local, State, national and world--which as citizens we should be informed about."

The Fund's interpretation of education for public responsibility was stated as follows: "The meaning includes the concept of leadership development in the Cooperative Extension Service, but is, perhaps, broader in that it embraces the development of the abilities to serve in any role of public leadership, paid and volunteer. Membership on committees, councils and boards comes within this definition---any role involving the making of public decisions."

Further progress was made toward project plans and the development of these plans. State applications were received and screened, a national project coordinator and consultant were sought; training plans and a training site for the program consultants were among agenda items.

Later, during the spring of 1959, the Fund announced the appointment of Dr. Frank W. Suggitt of Michigan State University as the national project coordinator. His appointment was to become effective June 1, 1959, and terminate December 31, 1961. His office was to be on the campus of Michigan State University where he had been Head of the Department of Resource Development. In this package also was the decision to train the consultants at Michigan State University. The same notice contained the announcement of the selection of Dr. Joseph L. Matthews, Assistant Director, Division of Extension Research and Training, Federal Extension Service, as consultant to the Fund for the duration of the project.

About the same time or perhaps earlier in the spring the participating States and counties were named. These were as follows:

State	Counties
Arizona	Yuma and Maricopa
Illinois	Champaign and DeKalb
Michigan	Huron and Berrien
Montana	Lewis and Clark, and Roosevelt
Pennsylvania	Erie and Adams
Texas	Kaufman and San Patricio

The individuals who were to serve as program consultants in each county were announced later.

To prepare the program consultants for the task with which they were to be confronted during the next two and one-half years, an intensified training program was planned for the summer of 1959. It was to commence on June 24 and terminate on September 4. The planned training was to be of ten weeks' duration and consist of five parts. (1) The core of the training was a seminar which continued throughout the ten-week period. National leaders were the primary participants and each of them discussed a current issue of importance. In addition each consultant registered for two courses for each of the two five-week periods; (2) special problems in Extension evaluation; (3) a course titled Area Analysis and Resource Development; (4) the elective courses; and (5) library study. For this effort the consultant would earn

sixteen hours of credit toward a degree at Michigan State University. During this period the consultants were paid a sum which included their total expenses plus an allowance for family members, plus full salary.

Training was planned for the consultants by a committee composed of representatives of the Fund, the Federal Extension Service, the Institute for Extension Personnel Development, the Development Committee for ECOP and Michigan State University.4/

Prior to registration by project consultants for the above program of study on June 24, a two-day (June 22 and 23, 1959) orientation meeting was to be held at the institution for the consultants, participating State Extension directors, and others.

No specific objectives were established for the training except as appeared in a June 15, 1959, statement prepared by Frank W. Suggitt, Project Coordinator, which relates that "The Ten-Week Training Program is thus vital to the future of the Program Consultants and the Project. The nucleus of the training program is a special seminar in which outstanding national leaders will discuss current issues and activities with the program consultants."

In addition to this training, the Fund planned a conference for State Extension directors and consultants prior to the beginning of summer school. Also planned was a two-week institute for State and county personnel involved in the project. The former, an orientation conference, was held at Michigan State University on June 22 and 23, 1959. The conference dealt with the clarification of program direction and objectives, project planning in the States and counties, and further legitimation.

A conference at Gull Lake, Michigan, designed for participating State and county personnel was held September 7-11, 1959, following the summer school. This conference was attended by some fifty persons and guests from the six project States. Among these were State directors, assistant directors, State program leaders, department heads, district agents and a few county staff personnel (usually the county agent from each of the two pilot counties in each State). The conference served as an orientation effort for most participants and focused attention on program objectives, functions, roles, methods of operation and future plans at the national and regional levels.

This was the final meeting of the program consultants prior to the assumption of their duties in pilot counties. However, a series of seminars were held for them during the 1959-61 period. These conferences were designed to ascertain project progress, strengths, weaknesses, innovations,

4/ Undated memorandum of the Fund for Adult Education--Cooperative Extension Service Project.

deletions and to assist consultants in solving problems. These conferences were held as follows:

Place	Dates
College Station, Texas	December 3-10, 1959
Boulder, Colorado	July 7-10, 1960
Columbus, Ohio	October 5-7, 1960
Phoenix, Arizona	March 7-10, 1961

The project coordinator, Dr. Frank Suggitt, was responsible for planning, with the assistance of the consultants and the Fund administrative unit, these conferences and other activities at the national level necessary to the successful accomplishment of the assigned mission. During the project period he was also to make occasional trips into participating State offices and pilot counties to make spot evaluations of the project progress and to provide assistance and advice wherever possible. In turn it was he who was to accumulate and disseminate information related to project progress, prepare a final evaluative report and to keep the Fund administrative staff adequately informed concerning all aspects of the project.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT IN COUNTIES AND STATES

Program consultant training at Michigan State University was completed with the final conference at Gull Lake in September 1959. Each program consultant had received very similar training, each had attended the same conferences, and each had been equally involved in a planning for the forthcoming venture. On the other hand, each program consultant had a different background. Their training and experiences were different, and their personalities, ideals, desires, and goals varied. No two program consultants would probably have analyzed a given problem or reacted to the solution precisely the same. They returned to their respective States to help chart the project course in situations which varied considerably from State to State and from county to county.

At the State level, changing personnel, staff study leave absences, and the rigidity of the Extension system exerted a profound influence upon this project. Other important factors influencing project performance were the degree of understanding of the project among Extension personnel and the attitudes of the local people. Under these diverse conditions, the project was initiated in 12 counties.

At the outset, most counties organized project advisory groups. Some counties decided that a project advisory committee was not necessary, while others elected to use their existing county Extension committee or county councils as project advisory groups. As was true with many aspects of the project, there was wide variation in the involvement of county Extension staff members in the project. Some staff members devoted full time to the project. Others did not become involved at all. In most but not in all project counties the program consultant's role was not successfully carried out.

Instead, it became necessary for the consultant to adopt the role of a public affairs agent to secure the cooperation of the county Extension staff members.

Where the project was active, and where it did involve many county people, it was generally widely applied in the county. Project elements included public affairs issues per se, but also encompassed other aspects of community life. Some of the public affairs subjects were: farm policy, taxation, public health, and public roads. Project activities included helping local people with their many pressing community development problems.

One county cited programs consisting of all-day meetings for which 70 men were registered. These public affairs offerings were titled: "Aid, Trade, and Survival," "New Community Decisions for a New Decade, " "Some Consequences of Agricultural Policy," "Organizing for the Age Fantastic," and "Township and County Government." The objective of these meetings was to train leadership in public affairs and to stimulate more people to assume their public responsibility.

The program consultant in this particular county reported, "Results are already apparent. A member of last year's workshop has won the primary election for the office of representatives in the legislature."

A tourist and resort association was organized in a county with the aid of project personnel. This association is still in existence and has seemingly proved very successful. In more than one county, youth counseling and guidance programs were inaugurated in schools. Classes in public policy education were held and at least one class was taken on a tour of the State capitol, visiting various State House offices, the State legislature, and Federal government offices. Rural-urban relations were strengthened via tours by rural residents into industrial areas and urban residents into farming areas.

In another county, county Extension staff members were oriented on public affairs education and its role in a county Extension program. Staff members made an effort to define public affairs education.

Workshops were held for both men and women in several counties. Some of the topics presented were: "The Price of Progress, " "Cost of Food," "Farm Programs and Subsidies," "Problems and Responsibilities in Internationnal Relations," "Human Problems in a Changing Community," "Aid, Trade, and Survival," "The Role of Women in a Changing Community," "Inflation," and "Understanding the Issues of the Fall Ballot." In addition, a series of programs on township zoning were presented.

Programs on taxation were a favorite subject. A program on taxation was developed with a campus-wide university committee in one State. The one county utilizing this material found excellent acceptance through a leader training effort. About 140 to 150 people attended the first training meeting. Many were from urban areas. About a fourth of them accepted leadership assignments in taxation. The innovation of a university-wide committee

proved very successful. It seemed to prove the usefulness and practicality of utilizing university-wide resources in support of Extension activities.

One county emphasized work with youth as their contribution to the Fund for Adult Education effort. As a basis for program development, a county-wide survey of youth and youth activities was made in cooperation with the county school system. Information obtained through the survey proved useful in county Extension program development.

In another county, "public affairs survey" studies were carried out in three communities. These surveys were helpful as bases for program design and as resource information in planning community educational programs. They directed program personnel into many facets of community development. Activities included planning, zoning, industrial development, and other affairs in which the communities exhibited an interest. In one county, a county planning director was appointed as a result of the project. Project personnel worked toward a program that was educational as well as service-oriented.

In another county, the project seemed to be geared to a long-range Extension program base. It helped expand the service and educational aspects of the Extension program into many new areas of county life. The county staff, including the program consultant, became involved in a community development project of nationwide interest in legislation affecting the local fruit industry, and in development of the long-range county Extension program.

One program consultant said that the staff became involved in helping people organize so that citizens could express their concerns about public matters. The staff provided resource materials in public affairs as a stimulant to encourage groups. Personnel working on other projects reported being involved in industrial development, foreign policy, youth development activities, resource development, farm policy, and the development of local leaders.

One county emphasized human resource development. They held countywide forums involving large numbers of citizens. Topics discussed in the forums included: "Inventorying and Utilizing Human Resources," "Organizing for Civic Action," and "Motivation and Problem Solving."

One aspect of the project in another county was family life education with focus on marriage counseling and a family life conference. Emphasis was also given to the affairs of municipal and county government and water drainage.

In summary, the project took many and diverse routes as agents carried out their assignments in public affairs education. Project design provided each county staff a free hand to plan and develop their program. This approach was essential, as each county was unique. A rigidly designed effort would have been doomed to failure from the outset.

County objectives: Personnel reported that project objectives were established in all but two counties. For this study, consultants were requested to review the overall project objectives as established by the national project authors

and to report the degree of emphasis given to each in the county. Their responses are reported below opposite each national objective.

National objective	Degree of emphasis in the county						
	Little or none	Some	Considerable	Great	No opinion	No response	Total
To broaden and strengthen the program offerings, stimulate interest of the public, and obtain citizen participation in public affairs.	0	0	5	4	1	2	12
To advance education for public responsibilities through involving large numbers of citizens in program planning and other appropriate experiences to develop their leadership abilities.	0	1	3	5	1	2	12
To communicate and extend the successful experiences gained to other counties and States.	2	3	3	1	1	2	12

This array of responses reflects the interests of the counties and the orientation of the project. It shows that almost equal emphasis was given "to advance education for public responsibilities" and "to broaden and strengthen the program offerings..." It also reveals that not much attention was given to the transmittal of successful experiences to other counties and States. Only four States reported significant progress toward this objective.

Additional objectives were adopted and reported by several project counties. These are listed below in groups by county.

County A:

(1) "One objective was to develop a program that would be a continuing one--not subject to coming and leaving of a program consultant. I had certain objectives I wanted to accomplish with County--County Staff and I had certain joint educational objectives we wanted to accomplish. Organized group of local people had certain objectives to bring improvements to County."

(2) "To place major responsibility for a continuing broad program in the hands of a large representative body of local people."

(3) "To coordinate major interest groups and foster close working relationships between Indian, non-Indian, farm and nonfarm groups and committees."

(4) "To test the capabilities of Extension to help fulfill expressed need of local people in public affairs education."

(5) "To maintain an 'open-door policy' and not place limitations on local people."

County B:

(1) "To involve lay leaders at all levels of programming."

(2) "To involve a representative group of people."

(3) "For people to implement as well as develop plans for educational emphasis."

County C:

(1) "To try new approaches to old programs."

County D:

(1) "Develop methods for adult education in public affairs."

(2) "Broaden county staff outlook and understanding of Extension Service."

(3) "Determine public's acceptance of Extension in public affairs work."

(4) "Balance the total program offered by County Extension Service."

(5) "Improve job of local program planning."

County E:

(1) "To identify the most effective procedures and techniques for involving a broadly representative group of volunteer local leaders in planning and carrying out an educational program, with particular emphasis on: (a) leadership development for public responsibility, and (b) public affairs education."

County F:

(1) "To expand and improve public affairs education in on-going programs within the various subject-matter fields."

(2) "Evaluate the programs for improvement."

County G:

(1) "Be an informed staff- inform cooperators about FAE-CES project."

(2) "Determine county situation."

(3) "Organize appropriate advisory board and train."

(4) "Initiate public affairs education programs."

(5) "Evaluate programs and FAE-CES project."

County project committee:

It seemed to be implicitly understood that a widely representative and active advisory committee of county leaders was desirable and probably essential to the success of the project. This was supported by the national objective, "To advance education for public responsibilities through involving large numbers of citizens in program planning and other appropriate experiences to develop their leadership abilities." This body was to be formed only after careful consideration by all county Extension staff personnel, the program consultant and State supervisory personnel. One or more avenues were open to personnel with respect to this committee: (1) It could be a continuation of the present county Extension committee, where one existed with a redefinition of its responsibilities to include public affairs education where this was lacking; (2) the existing county Extension committee, if there was one, could be expanded and its functions redefined; (3) a new committee could be formed; (4) program councils could be used in counties where they existed, or (5) the project could be carried on with no committee. These essentially were the alternatives in forming an advisory committee.

Personnel were requested to report action taken in regard to an advisory committee. The reports for the twelve project counties are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Action Taken in Each County with Respect to the Formation of A Program Development Committee for the FAE-CES Project

Action Taken	Number of Counties	Percent
A county FAE-CES project advisory committee was formed solely for this project.	1	8
The existing county Extension committee was reorganized and served in an advisory capacity to the project.	2	17
The joint agriculture, home economics and/or 4-H Extension councils served as an advisory committee.	3	25
The regular Extension advisory committee served as advisory unit to this project.	1	8
A subcommittee of the regular Extension advisory committee was formed to advise on public affairs activities.	2	17
There was no advisory committee for this project.	3	25
TOTAL	12	100

In some manner, the existing county Extension committee was used as a base in forming a project advisory committee in the majority of the counties. This seemed to be a logical starting point since this committee is supposedly representative of the county and committee members are usually strong supporters of the Extension program. Two of the counties reported that this committee was reorganized so as to be better suited to the newly developed role of project advisory body. In three counties there were separate advisory groups for each of the Extension county program phases, i.e., home economics, agriculture and the youth program. These groups, called councils by the county personnel, were combined on occasions to provide the advisory function for the project. Another county reported that the regular Extension advisory committee served as the advisory unit to the project with little or no modification of membership. In two other counties, subcommittees of the

regular county Extension committees were formed. Members of thenew committees were primarily from membership of the regular committee but other members were added so as to provide a more complete representation of the county citizenry. These new subcommittees were advisory in the public affairs aspect of the program. The original committee maintained its function of overall county Extension program development. One county reported the outright formation of a committee to perform the advisory function and for program development where there had never before been an Extension advisory committee in the county. There were also three counties where no advisory committee of any type was organized. In two of these, there apparently was little or no effort made to organize such a committee. In the third county, an effort to form a committee failed when only one prospective member, out of many that were expected, showed up for the organizational meeting.

Project advisory committees seemed closely related to the pre-project county Extension committee. These counties all tapped the experiences of the old committee members in developing the county program under the new project. It was perhaps essential that such existing committees were involved in the project planning. Not to involve them would have been to disregard a substantial portion of the local agricultural leadership. It seemed important that these Extension supporters be included. Also, because many Extension committees have strong agricultural orientation, it is perhaps important that modifications were made in membership composition so that the program would have broader based community support. It may have been more desirable to form new subcommittees with some new membership mixed with a portion of former committee members. Such a committee would have provided stability and continuity with the on-going program yet increased vision for the new project.

The counties which settled on using the existing groups with little or no modification seemed less confident of program direction than those counties that organized new advisory organizations.

The amount of program action achieved by this project in the counties, either favorably or adversely, was reflected in the emphasis placed upon committee organization. The counties which either formed new or substantially new committees or added considerably to the old were most active. Those with no committee were least active. It is quite possible that the impetus essential to the formation of a desirable committee was also the impetus that initiated the more aggressive activities.

Personnel time devoted to the project

There was wide variation among personnel in project counties in the degree of their acceptance of the program. The program consultants had accepted the program as it was presented at Michigan State University. Each consultant made an earnest effort to implement it in his project county. Consultants devoted approximately 90 percent of their time to the project. They spent minor amounts of their time helping the regular county Extension

personnel with the on-going Extension program. Roughly 45 percent of the program consultant's time was devoted to program development. This included both collecting and summarizing factual data about the county and work with citizens in forming, conducting, and evaluating a county Extension program. About 38 percent of consultant's time was devoted to public affairs education, resource development, and community development, eight percent was used in assisting the county staff members with the on-going Extension program and eight percent was classified as "other" types of work.

This time distribution was by no means consistent among the program consultants. They concentrated on different subjects.

Table 2. Percentage of Personnel Time Devoted to the FAE Project in the Project Counties

Type of Activity	Percent of Project Time		
	Program Consultant	County Agent	Home Agent
Program development	45	20	16
Public affairs education	20	14	6
Resource development	8	7	1
The agricultural, home economics or 4-H program	9	48	70
Consumer marketing	0	1	3
Community development	10	6	4
Other	8	4	0
TOTAL	100	100	100

The average Extension agricultural county agent in these project counties devoted approximately 50 percent of his time to the on-going Extension program. During this project period about 20 percent of his time went into program development efforts, and the remaining 30 percent was concentrated primarily on other new program areas. This was not consistent among the agricultural agents. One reported devoting 90 percent of his time during this period to the on-going Extension program in the county. Another reported no time spent on the on-going program but that all his time was in the project effort.

Home agents showed less receptivity to deviation from their usual programs than did the agricultural agents. The home agents said that they spent approximately 70 percent of their time in their usual programs and only about 26 percent in the FAE-CES project.

There were wide variances among counties in the same State with respect to agent time devoted to this project. This, of course, attests to the freedom of choice with which county Extension personnel operate under the cooperative administrative arrangement and also to the need for the complete involvement and agreement of all personnel expected to participate in such programs.

Subjects commonly presented in the program:

In each county, it was necessary to decide upon program subject matter content within the primary issues and/or interests of the people in the county. Which subjects would most benefit the clientele? Which could be adequately provided within the limited resources of county staff? Program content is in many counties a product of an advisory committee, but it may also be directed by the State office. Local citizens may have special requests, or the agents may select program content based upon observed or reported needs.

The program consultants and the agricultural and home agents were involved in deciding on subject matter content. In several project counties, there were no others involved. A project advisory committee was involved in making decisions in only 5 of the 12 counties according to reports. Of these five, two project advisory committees, composed solely of local citizenry, made the decisions on subject matter content. In a few counties, other persons were also involved in these decisions. These included the 4-H Club agent, the district Extension supervisor, the State Extension director, and associate or assistant county agents.

The procedure for developing the subject matter content was not, in all counties, precisely as foreseen by authors of the project. Deviation from the prescribed program development routine was undoubtedly dictated by attitudes of county or State Extension staff members toward recommended program development procedures, by the political climate within the county with respect to Extension, and perhaps by the lack of confidence in or understanding of the process by the consultant himself.

A considerable range of subjects were selected. Those most often selected were:

Farm policy matters
Community development
Economic growth
Zoning and planning
Taxation and tax policies
Public health
Public roads

Other subjects presented in some counties were:

Public education (including programs for school dropouts)
Marriage counseling
Swamp drainage
Family life problems
Nutrition lecture series
Vital issues
Indian reservation problems
Local, state and national government and politics

International relations
Land policy
Foreign trade
Social Security
Public spending
Public services

Methods used in carrying out public affairs education:

Methods utilized to disseminate information in any educational effort are limited by many factors. Among these are the availability of facilities, capabilities of the staff members, and staff member attitudes toward each method. This is aside from the effectiveness of the methods. Personnel reported using the following methods most frequently in carrying out public affairs activities:

Newspaper releases
Tie-ins with other meetings
Radio programs
Meeting series

Also reported used, but less frequently, were:

Television programs
Forums
Town meetings
Short courses
Discussion series involving
countywide subcommittees
Survey involvement

Not all methods were equally effective nor were all agents skilled in the use of each method.

Extension agents and consultants reported the meeting series as the most effective method. Also listed in order of their effectiveness were:

Tie-ins with other meetings
Short courses
Forums
Discussion series with countywide
subcommittees of the county
development committee
Survey involvement
Family life educational
conferences

Newspaper releases were used more than other methods, but neither agents nor program consultants considered this the most effective method. This was also true of radio programs. In contrast, they concluded that forums and

short courses were very effective methods for public affairs education but did not use them as often as other methods.

In one county, a number of subcommittees of the program development committee were organized in special subject areas for program planning and implementation. The series of discussions in these subcommittees proved fruitful. This seemed to be one of the most effective methods of involving large numbers of people in public affairs education. Other personnel concluded that it was this group themselves who received the most public affairs education.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Kinds of Apparent Changes Resulting from the Program

It is difficult to identify the spark that may have ignited the fire of progress in a county or community. But there are changes which evolve, either directly or indirectly, and which one may contribute to a given effort. In this sense, the consultants and other persons involved in this project were asked to report changes which stemmed from project efforts. These changes are grouped and discussed here. It is well to keep in mind that conservative estimates place the number of people contacted directly, i.e., attended meetings, served on committees, etc., at 20,000 and that approximately 9,000 of these were people that Extension had never worked with previously.

Changes in citizens' attitudes:

Changes in citizens' attitudes as a result of this program were reported by consultants in 10 of the counties. One reported that, "The greatest change occurred in the indicated interest of Home Demonstration Club women in public issues and problems. In pursuing this interest, club members took much greater leadership responsibility in planning and carrying out programs."

Another reported, "The program has been and is still growing--continuing to involve new people and develop new leadership as a continued effort is made to improve levels of understanding of people and make better use of other resources."

As a result of these efforts in one project county, a United States Senator reported, "The progressive leaders of this county, white and Indian, town and country, have shown how to make government work for the benefit of their fellow citizens." He further stated that, "In sum, these community leaders . . . are planning the present. They view the Federal government as a partner whose programs should be used selectively and fitted to local needs, rather than as a villian to be denounced. I commend the good sense of the people of_____county." Some of the accomplishments the Senator reported were: improvement of health facilities, recreational development, new educational programs, and industrial developments.

Another county reported that citizens became more involved and interested in planning for change. They were more alert to their environmental conditions in the communities and several citizens assumed new community roles. Reports from one county stated that local citizens' concept of the role of Extension was changed. Also that attitudes toward taxation, youth problems, and family life were altered. This all came about from action associated with the project.

One consultant reported that, "As the result of a course in politics, several people took an active part in their political parties." Stimulated by educational efforts in planning and zoning in one county, a zoning coordinating committee was appointed by the county supervisors. In turn, this educational program on rural zoning was adopted by the Farm Bureau as a part of their program with rural people. Also reported was that this type of work "on community problems" put citizens in new roles and encouraged their participation in public affairs.

Citizens meetings to resolve problems ranked high as one of the activities evolving from the program. Eight county program consultants cited meetings held to help resolve problems which had been identified through efforts of the project. In this regard, one county reported that the project resulted in the formation of . . . . . a County Planning and Improvement Council and that this Council has developed guidance counseling in four high schools, resulted in the joint hiring of other teachers among small schools, has surveyed the youth needs of the county, carried out recreational developments, and has resulted in National agricultural legislation. In addition, a system has been established for the continuous evaluation of county needs in cultural arts, education, welfare, taxation, roads, recreation and tourism, economic growths and resource evaluation.

In one county where Extension had carried a strictly rural agricultural program, several family life meetings were held. This involved both rural and urban families. A survey was made to help identify and analyze problems of youth in the county. County Extension Council members' horizons were broadened and interests altered as they took new leadership responsibilities in diverse community improvement activities. A committee was formed and meetings were held to investigate the feasibility of rural zoning. Planning and zoning meetings were held in communities throughout one county.

New leadership roles:

New leadership roles were adopted by many county committee members as the direction of the Extension program began to be altered in some project counties. These leaders were both old and new clientele of Extension. The new program directions included: rural zoning, improved education, recreational enterprises, better government, roads, industrialization, and human relations. Just as the project injected new life into an on-going Extension program, so did the new leadership roles help develop new leadership capabilities for those who participated and for the counties and areas in which they lived.

Community development:

During the project, community activities centered around public affairs education and program development. Activites included not only those in leadership roles but the rank and file of those in community life both urban and rural.

In one county, the family life program was a main thrust into community development work. Another county worked with both white and Indian citizens in developing the community. One county reported 250 people actively participating in the countywide councils and the committees. The effects of the project were felt by many organizations and agencies resulting in better understanding, cooperation, and enhancement of community development activities in the county.

Activities in world affairs were emphasized by one county. A Rotary Club sponsored a travel and adventure series as a project activity. Farmers who had traveled abroad were in great demand as speakers. During the project, they made public appearances throughout the county.

Community improvements:

Changes in physical appearances of a community or area are more easily discernable than are changes in attitudes of the people. However, physical changes too reflect the attitudes of the community, its well being, and expectations. Counties reported that community improvement activities included sewage disposal, water system improvement, and land use mapping in and adjacent to prospective industrial sites. Other improvements were in housing developments, health and sanitary facilities, and roads.

Economic development:

Economic development was given attention in two project counties. Activities included an evaluation of county resources, land use studies, an active land use mapping program, improved water supply to meet industry needs, sewage disposal, school reorganization to make schools more attractive to industrial prospects, and several community studies of human resources.

A tourist and resort association also was organized to aid in developing the industry. When the main project ended, the tourist association had been operating for two years and was the recognized representative of the tourist and resort industry in the county. In some counties, new businesses were established in agriculture and industry; other businesses were revived.

Governmental changes:

Tax consultants reported that in one county the principal governmental change was its improved tax planning program. In another, the officials changed their attitudes and appointed a committee to study planning and zoning. This seemed to accomplish a most worthwhile change in government.

One consultant said that in his county the project resulted in an "awakening of government."

School system:

Project consultants pointed to two principal changes in the school system that sprang from the project. Counseling services were added and special teachers were hired through the joint efforts of small schools. Youth studies also were carried out in the counties. Results from these studies were used to plan more effective school and general youth programs.

Staff members' attitudes toward public affairs education:

Extension personnel know that county Extension staff members do not give public affairs education the same status that they give several other subject matter areas.

Some staff members advocate public affairs education and practice it religiously. Conversely, some believe public affairs education has no place in a county Extension program and provide none. However, most county Extension staff members probably do contribute some time to this program. It is not often a major portion of their program. Neither is it the smallest.

Some measure of change in county staff members' attitudes toward public affairs education was desirable. As a means of appraising this change, program consultants were requested to report whether they had observed a change in staff members' attitudes toward the subject and, if so, to what degree.

Table 3. Program Consultants' Reports as to Whether There Was or Was Not a Positive Change in the County Extension Staff Members' Attitudes Toward Public Affairs Education and the Extent of the Changes.

(a) Number of personnel changing:	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW OR NO RESPONSE
Agricultural Agent	8	3	1
Home Economics Agent	10	2	-
4-H Club Agent	6	1	5

(b) The extent of personnel changes reported above:

	GREAT	CONSIDERABLE	SOME	LITTLE OR NONE	DON'T KNOW OR NO RESPONSE
Agricultural Agent	3	3	2	-	4
Home Economics Agent	-	5	5	-	2
4-H Club Agent	-	1	5	-	6

Program consultants reported that there was a positive change in most Extension staff members' attitudes in project counties. But, during the project, the agricultural agent's attitude in three counties and the home economics agent's attitude in two counties did not favor public affairs education.

In several counties, the 4-H Club agent did not fully participate in the project for one reason or another. This explains why five consultants that responded were listed under "Don't Know or No Response," in the summary. The summary of only six replies in positive attitude changes of 4-H Club agents does not necessarily mean that others did not change nor should we conclude that they had an opportunity to change. To interpret more accurately the five "Don't Know or No Response" replies, we would perhaps say that they were not observed by the consultant.

Of those who made positive changes as interpreted by the consultant, three made "great" change and nine made "considerable" positive change toward public affairs education. The remaining 50 percent of those who made favorable change only changed "some".

To sum up these responses from the consultants' reports, we could safely say that out of 36 county Extension staff members, 12 (33 percent) showed definite positive changes in attitudes toward the program. Twelve others (33 percent) had some minor positive change in attitude. Consultants also reported that six of the agents definitely did not have a positive change in attitude toward public affairs education. The remaining six were not involved in the project sufficiently to cause a change in their attitudes.

Things learned and applied:

Program consultants were able to cite some things learned which had been applied in the county and State Extension programs. Of the 12 consultants, 11 cited something learned in the project which had been applied as a regular part of the county program. Eight reported that their State Extension office had adopted something learned from the project.

At the county level, most commonly adopted items were in the areas of organizing, program action, program evaluation, program subject matter, and broadened clientele. State Extension services in some States learned about and adopted materials and methods in broadening program clientele, organizing, and methods with the annual plan of work.

The factor mentioned most frequently was a "broadened program clientele" in the county. Consultants said it differently, but the meaning was the same. Listed below are some of their comments. One consultant said: "Organizing people to develop programs--involving people in implementation of program and evaluation--a much broader program clientele." "People look to Extension for a broader type of program and information." "Primarily resulting from family life survey--discovered how to plan and carry out more completely and satisfactorily, with bigger clientele, a public affairs program through Extension."

"One program consultant in public affairs does not make a public affairs program for a county--needs the unified efforts of all county staff--all schooled in public affairs thinking." "The people will respond to this type of program if we are willing to devecte necessary time and effort. Less apt to get into stereo-typed approaches--they are more critical of our activities." "Staff tends to take program planning process more seriously than before. Analyze relevant data more thoroughly for planning and subject matter meetings."

Where a vigorous project was carried out, almost without exception, staff members learned more about organizing for program development. This was especially true for new clientele in urban areas. One agent remarked that, "as a new technique or method was recognized to be valuable, it was applied 'across the board' for all program activities." These agents for the most part had not worked with urban people or other "new" Extension clientele. It was a revelation to organize and work with such groups.

Following this project, State Extension staff members in at least one State have committed a greater part of their resources to public affairs education and program development. A less conventional approach is being used in this State Extension program. Also, as a result of this project, one State Extension office learned about and adopted the values of its Statewide organizations.

In summary, it appears that all project counties learned from activities carried out under this project. Some counties and States learned and adopted more than others. Even though not reported by the consultant, every county learned and adopted some things as a result of this project. In most instances, counties learned and adopted the practice of working with new and different people.

Moreover, several counties learned that in instances where the local people took leadership roles through committees and subcommittees, more could be accomplished than was possible by county staff personnel working on a strictly service basis. They met and acquired new clientele and subject matter which had never before been a part of the Extension program. These new approaches to public affairs education demanded new skills and knowledge from specialists at the college.

At the State level, supervisors, specialists, program leaders, and administrators began to hear of the successes, failures, problems, and solutions. Some of the successful elements were adopted and applied in the statewide Extension program. In at least two States, this project was the primary basis for innovations in program methods. In these two States, the new methods are a significant part of the State Extension program. The Extension program in both States was altered to adopt a strong program development effort. The model in one State is almost identical to that recommended for this project. The second is a modification of this model with variations to fulfill local needs.

OBSTACLES TO PROJECT PROGRESS

There were many variables affecting the outcome of the project from the very start. The project design, the way it was announced to the educational institutions, the States which were selected, methods of project county selection, attitudes of the various personnel involved, the individuals chosen to serve as program consultants, the duration of the project and many others would have an effect on the degree of success or failure. It was possible to evaluate the effects of some of the important factors upon the project based on the opinions of the program consultants, Table 4.

Table 4. Program Consultants' Opinions of the Obstacles and Impediments to Progress in the FAE Project, 1963.

Item	Great	Considerable	Somewhat	Little or not at all	No opinion
Attitudes of the county Extension staff	1	3	6	2	0
Attitudes of the State administrative staff	3	3	1	5	0
Attitudes of the supervisory staff	0	3	4	4	1
Attitudes of local lay people	1	1	4	6	0
Consultant role	3	2	1	6	0
Type of training received by consultants	0	0	2	9	1
Objectives of the program	1	1	3	5	2
Other	1	2	1	0	0

Other: a. Lack of status in Extension Service by program consultant.
b. Change of supervisors in mid-stream.
c. Budget cut.
d. Worked on State staff mostly rather than in the county.

Six program consultants reported "attitudes of the State administrative staff" as major impediments in their counties. The "consultant's role" itself was looked upon as a leading obstacle by five of these personnel. They believed that this role was not a desirable one for working with the county Extension staff. It seemed that their inexperience in Extension, in many but not all cases, relative low status among Extension personnel, and the already busy schedule of the county Extension personnel did not make the advisory function of the program consultant too tenable with the county staff. In some counties however, the consultant role seemed to work very well. Also it seemed that attitudes of the county Extension staff were a substantial factor in impeding project progress. Such factors as consultant training, project objectives, attitudes of local lay people and attitudes of

Extension supervisors did not seem to be major obstacles. In fact, many of these factors gave impetus and strength to the effort.

Other impeding factors mentioned by the consultants included: The "lack of status in Extension of the consultant," "change of supervisors in mid-stream," "budget cut," and that "most of my time was spent on the State staff rather than in the project county."

Duration of the project:

Most of the consultants, 8 of 12, believed that such a project should be given five years to develop. They felt that the 2½ year period was too short. Many reported that they were barely able to get a program underway in the county before the project was terminated. Also, that there was a let-down in interest in anticipation of the termination date in many counties.

Table 5. Program Consultants' Opinions on the Desirable Duration of this Type Project.

Item	Number Reports
One year or less	0
5 years	8
10 years	0
Over 10 years	0
Don't know	3
Total	11

Those who designed this project point out that the project was prepared, planned, and initiated with the understanding that the duration would be five years. This was considered to be a minimum time to accomplish the objectives. The decision to phase out FAE without provision for supporting the project full term had inevitable consequences that seriously impaired its chances of success.

Consultants' ratings of their role:

The consultants were divided about evenly on the effectiveness of their role as program consultant. Six thought it was "relatively effective" or "very effective" while the others thought it ineffective or only moderately effective. Mostly they felt that the county staff did not accept them in the role of program consultant because the staff was not properly prepared by the State staff for the project; the staff was too busy with their regular program; the consultants did not have status in Extension for one or more reasons; or that they got off to a poor start because of their lack of experience in the Extension Service.

Table 6. Program Consultants' Ratings of Their Role as Program Consultant.

Item	Number
Very effective	2
Relatively effective	4
Moderately effective	3
Ineffective	3
Total	12

Program consultants' attitudes toward repeating the FAE-CES project experience:

The consultants were mostly divided on this question along the lines of their relative successes and lack of them in the project.

Item	Number Reports
Readily	6
Hesitant	4
Turn it down	2
Total	12

Progress and the consultant's role:

During training at Michigan State University, the role of the program consultant was defined by the authors of the project in cooperation with the program consultants. Their 15 functions were spelled out in some detail. In evaluating the project, each program consultant was asked to indicate the degree of completion of each of these objectives. If it was not fully accomplished during his tenure, he was to give the reason why. This section summarizes these statements.

This summary of consultant performance reveals some important program development.

The responses of the 12 consultants reporting on accomplishments of each of 15 objectives are summarized as follows:

	Number Reports	Percentage of Total Reports
Fully accomplished	46	26
Mostly accomplished	64	36
Partially accomplished	51	28
Little or no accomplishment	19	10
Total	180	100

Perhaps consultants were more critical of themselves than others would have been. Their expectations were quite high as they tackled their jobs in the counties. However, there was considerable variation among the counties in program activity. A few counties carried out a vigorous program and the consultant accomplished almost everything "fully" while in other counties there was "little or no accomplishment" toward any of the objectives. The degree of accomplishment is important, but the reason for progress or the lack of it holds the key message for the Extension program in any future public affairs educational efforts of this type.

Some of the principle impediments to progress were as follows:

1. It was almost universally agreed by the consultants and others associated with the project that more than the 30 months of project time would have been helpful.

2. A major impediment seemed to be a lack of understanding of the consultant's job. Consultants indicated that lack of cooperation and/or understanding by the county Extension staff members was a serious deterrent in several counties.

3. In a few cases, the Extension staff was not aware that their county was being considered for the project until it had already been selected. This contributed to the lack of interest and cooperation by the county staff and violated one of the initial criteria for project county selection.

4. Lack of support. Other reasons given for unachieved goals were the lack of administrative support at the State level, lack of administrative support at the district level, and the lack of specialist support.

5. Some consultants reported that they were denied assistance from the project coordinator at critical periods. Apparently, requests for assistance by the coordinator were not fulfilled or only partially fulfilled.

6. More help from the University's interdisciplinary committee was desired but denied to some counties. This committee was organized to assist counties in this new endeavor. These committees did not all function as smoothly as desired nor was assistance always forthcoming from "across campus."

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The project was divided into three distinct phases:

1. The planning and selection of participating States and counties.

2. The training of program consultants.

3. The action phase at the county level.

This project was an important methodological experiment in public affairs and leadership for public responsibilities by the Cooperative Extension Service. Detailed plans were formulated, and explicit announcements were sent to States. One consultant per county was to be selected by participating States, and both the consultant and county staff were to meet rigid selection criteria. The county staff was to be willing to work as a team on an experimental program, to deviate from traditional Extension programs and run the risk of failure. The consultant was to be a participant observer but not take an active part in county project activities involving local people. This would require the county staff to redirect its program or to take on additional programs which were expected to be continued after the 2½ year period. To divert their efforts would almost surely mean discontinuing some phases of the former program. The consequences of such a move were certainly not to be considered lightly in view of the short duration of the project support. What would follow? These factors were clearly pointed out to States by the planners of the project, with recommendations that they were to be thoroughly analyzed by the State and county staff members before counties were selected. Somewhere in this process there seemed to occur "a slip twixt the cup and the lip." In some States, county staff members said they had very little or no predesignation discussion with their State administrators. In fact, at least one county was not informed of its selection until after it had been submitted as a project county. This was not in keeping with the terms of the agreement and it set the stage for misunderstanding and conflict.

One thing that would have helped to alleviate such occurrences would have been a general briefing in each State by the project authors for all parties concerned. However, they could not foresee the need for this since they expected complete agreement as outlined in their selection criteria. This was a State responsibility which had measurable impact upon the conduct of the project.

If one had examined thoroughly the credentials of the prospective program consultants, he would have avoided one or more as candidates for the positions. The criteria were not fulfilled in all instances. The terms of the agreement specified the type of person for this job. But States may have had difficulty obtaining people willing to change jobs for a short 2½ year period with little or no personal gain apparent. Two consultants had had no previous Extension experience. Other consultants who were subordinates in a county staff were selected to return to the same staff after 10 weeks of training to serve as advisors to their former superiors. This had significant impact upon the outcome of the project. Here again, criteria were adequate, but pressures of time and personnel shortages forced unfavorable factors into the project effort.

The States needed more time to consider salient factors and exercise greater prudence in choosing project consultants. Closer supervision of State planning and consultant selection phases by project authors perhaps could have ameliorated later difficulties with county staff members as well as consultant relations with county staff members. Overall, plans seemed adequately prepared, but the implementation at the State level showed short-comings.

The 10 weeks of training received by consultants at Michigan State University seemed suitable. Ten of the 12 consultants reported that they would "readily accept" repeat training of this type.

Considering all kinds of training received, the program consultants seemed most enthusiastic about their seminar experiences. The seminars were held on three afternoons each week for the 10-week training period. The purpose was to give consultants an opportunity to discuss and analyze significant problems in the fields of public affairs education leadership and social action. Recognized authorities in each field were resource persons. A course titled "Area Analysis and Resource Development" seemed very useful to those who took it. Also very useful according to the enrollees was the course in "Social Action." Relatively popular, but less than those cited above, were "Political Science" and "Program Evaluation." The consultants, based on their experiences in the project counties, placed less value on "Land Use Planning," "Public Affairs" and "Agricultural Policy."

When asked to list other types of training that would have been useful, each responded freely and with a multitude of suggestions. Subjects reported most frequently were social action, community and/or resource development, and evaluation. Other subjects included: individual counseling, motivational techniques, human relations, economics, taxation, and other subjects which applied specifically to this project.

It seemed that the training of program consultants was appropriate for the time allotted. The seminar appeared especially effective from both the management and participant standpoints. The training in social action was quite effective as was the area analysis and resource development training. Each of these efforts appeared to give trainees tools useful in organizing and conducting the project in counties.

No two counties proceeded alike toward project objectives. Certain counties emphasized involving new clientele in Extension; others inserted new program elements into efforts with the same clientele, but in some counties attempts at progress were only token efforts which proved discouraging and called for retreat and retrenchment.

Indications seem to support the wide involvement of citizens in this type of project. Where this occurred, there appeared to be greater success with the project. This observation is supported by advisory committee activities. Where a new committee was formed for the project or where there was a substantial addition of new committee members to operating committees, there seemed to be greater project accomplishment than where additions to the committees were nil or minor.

At the outset, project consultants were confident of success. They devoted full time to the project effort to save minor assistance with the on-going county Extension program. Among the regular county staff members, attitudes ranged from complete confidence to complete doubt. Time devoted to the project ranged from 90 percent by one agent to zero for several agents. It was obvious that some of the agents had never agreed to work on the project. They greeted it with skepticism and as another time-consuming task cast upon their already overburdened schedule. In other instances, county staff members expressed enthusiastic interest and pursued the opportunity with vigor and determination.

In only 5 of the 12 counties was there wide citizen participation in deciding on program content. Agents reported that forums and short courses were the most effective methods of reaching people with public affairs information. Methods most frequently used, however, included meeting series and newspaper releases.

Project county personnel cited several indications of accomplishments resulting from the project. They mentioned changes in citizen attitudes, with many accepting new leadership roles in county affairs. Additional interests in education were apparent in citizens, also. Personnel reported the joint hiring of teachers among schools as a program innovation. Other activities cited as accomplishments were in the areas of community development, community improvements, and governmental changes.

The project resulted in identifiable changes in the county Extension program in 11 of the 12 project counties and in each of the six project States. In the counties, the most commonly adopted items were in the areas of organizing, program action, program evaluation, program subject matter, and broadened clientele base. State Extension services in some States learned about and adopted materials and methods in broadening program clientele, organizing, and methods with the annual plan of work.

One of the gravest shortcomings of the project seemed to lie in the communication of successes and failures among States and counties. Even though this was explicitly stated as a project objective, it seemed to fall almost completely apart. More and closer supervision of this activity would have helped.

General observations

- To obtain the cooperation of the county staff members in introducing new programs or changes in county Extension programs, all county Extension staff members must be fully informed from the very outset of the project and agree to the innovation.

- A representative broadly based body of county clientele is desirable, if not essential, to the successful implementation of broadly based county Extension programs.

* To be successful, new county Extension programs must have the support and backing of supervisory and administrative personnel. These personnel must be fully informed and agreeable to the innovations if the effort is expected to be successful.

* A person to serve as consultant to a county staff or other body must have the complete respect and confidence of the staff. If he does not have this, he must be capable of gaining it. Otherwise, he will have great difficulty in directing the county program and staff into new program areas.

* Where demands are strong for current Extension resource uses, there is less likelihood of diverting personnel efforts to new and different areas of work.

* A project such as this undertaken to change a program in a county should have a duration of at least five years as time to permit measurable change.

THE LIBRARY OF
SEP 13 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION